arXiv:1404.3623v2 [math.AP] 15 Jul 2014

MULTIPLE SOLUTIONS FOR AN INDEFINITE ELLIPTIC PROBLEM WITH CRITICAL GROWTH IN THE GRADIENT

LOUIS JEANJEAN AND HUMBERTO RAMOS QUOIRIN

Abstract. We consider the problem

$$(P) \qquad -\Delta u = c(x)u + \mu|\nabla u|^2 + f(x), \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega),$$

where Ω is a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 3$, $\mu > 0$ and $c, f \in L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q > \frac{N}{2}$ with $f \gneqq 0$. Here c is allowed to change sign. We show that when $c^+ \not\equiv 0$ and $c^+ + \mu f$ is suitably small, this problem has at least two positive solutions. This result contrasts with the case $c \leq 0$, where uniqueness holds. To show this multiplicity result we first transform (P) into a semilinear problem having a variational structure. Then we are led to the search of two critical points for a functional whose superquadratic part is indefinite in sign and has a so called *slow growth* at infinity. The key point is to show that the Palais-Smale condition holds.

1. Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 3$. In this paper we are concerned with the boundary value problem

$$(P) \qquad -\Delta u = c(x)u + \mu|\nabla u|^2 + f(x), \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega),$$

where

$$(\mathcal{H}) \qquad \mu > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad c, f \in L^q(\Omega) \text{ for some } q > \frac{N}{2}, \ f \gneqq 0.$$

Quasilinear elliptic equations with a gradient dependence up to the critical growth $|\nabla u|^2$ were first studied by Boccardo, Murat and Puel in the 80's [12, 13, 14] and have been an active field of research until now, see for example [2, 18, 19]. To situate our problem we underline that we are interested in bounded solutions. The main goal of this paper is to carry on the study of non-uniqueness of solutions for such problems, which (P) is a prototype of.

The sign of c plays in (P) a central role regarding uniqueness, as well as existence, of bounded solutions. We refer to [20] for a heuristic discussion on the influence of the sign of c on the nature of the problem. The case $c \leq -\alpha_0$ a.e. in Ω for some $\alpha_0 > 0$ is referred to as the coercive case. In this case, the existence of solutions holds under very general assumptions and it was shown in [9, 10] (see also [8, 11]) that there is a unique bounded solution. When one just requires $c \leq 0$ (in particular when $c \equiv 0$) the situation is already more complex. The fact that restrictions on the data are necessary for (P) to have a solution was first observed in [16, 17]. Concerning uniqueness, some partial results are given in [9, 10], but it was only in [6] that uniqueness of bounded solutions was established under the mere condition $c \leq 0$. See also [7] for an extension to a larger class of problems.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J20, 35J61, 35J91.

Key words and phrases. indefinite variational problem, critical growth in the gradient, superlinear term with slow growth, Cerami condition.

The second author was supported by the FONDECYT project 11121567.

The case $c \gneqq 0$ started to be studied only recently. Surely in part because it was not accessible by the methods traditionally used in the coercive case. It was shown in [20], when $c \gneqq 0$ and for any c, μ and f sufficiently small in an appropriate sense, that (P) has two solutions. See also [1, 3, 24] for related results. Note that the case where μ is allowed to be non constant was treated in [6] leading also, when $c \gneqq 0$ and under appropriate conditions, to the existence of two bounded solutions.

In view of these results it remained to analyse the case where c is allowed to change sign, which is the aim of the present paper. Roughly speaking we shall show that the uniqueness is lost as soon as $c^+ \not\equiv 0$, where $c^+ = \max\{0, c\}$, see Theorem 1.1.

To obtain this result we first make a change a variable. It is well-known, since [21], that the change of variable

$$v = \frac{1}{\mu}(e^{\mu u} - 1)$$

rids the gradient term of (P), reducing it to a semilinear problem with a variational structure. We consider here a slight variation of this change of variable, namely,

$$v = \frac{1}{\lambda}(e^{\mu u} - 1), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ will be fixed later at our convenience. This leads to the problem

$$(Q) \qquad -\Delta v - (c(x) + \mu f(x))v = c(x)g_\lambda(v) + \frac{\mu}{\lambda} f(x), \quad v \in H^1_0(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega),$$

where

$$g_\lambda(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda}(1 + \lambda s)\ln(1 + \lambda s) - s & \text{if } s \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s \leq 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

We shall prove in Lemma 2.1 that if v is a non negative solution of (Q) then u defined by (1.1) is a non negative (and therefore positive, by Harnack inequality) solution of (P). Solutions of (Q) will be obtained as critical points of the functional

$$I(v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla v|^2 - [c(x) + \mu f(x)](v^+)^2\right] - \int_\Omega c(x)G_\lambda(v^+) - \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)v$$

defined on $H^1_0(\Omega)$ and where $G_\lambda(s) = \int_0^s g_\lambda(t)\,dt$. Note that since $f \geq 0$, critical points of I are necessarily non-negative, see Lemma 2.1. Since g_λ behaves essentially as $s\ln(s+1)$ for s large, the superquadratic part of I has at infinity a growth which is usually referred to as a *slow superlinear growth*.

To obtain two critical points we start following the strategy used in [20]. Note that if the positive part of $c + \mu f$ is not 'too large' in a suitable sense (cf. Lemma 2.3) then

$$\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla v|^2 - [c(x) + \mu f(x)](v^+)^2\right]$$

is coercive. Moreover, as G_λ is superquadratic, we shall prove that I takes positive values on a sphere $\|v\| = R_\lambda$ if the lower order term coefficient $\frac{\mu}{\lambda}$ is sufficiently small. Here comes the advantage of the change of variable (1.1): we may take λ sufficiently large so as to have $\frac{\mu}{\lambda}$ sufficiently small. This argument is possible because G_λ grows sufficiently slowly with respect to λ, see Lemma 2.2. Moreover it is easily seen that since $f \not\equiv 0$, I takes negative values in the ball $B(0, R_\lambda)$. Finally, since $c^+ \not\equiv 0$, it is possible to show that I takes a negative value at some point v_0 outside of the ball $B(0, R_\lambda)$. Thus I has a mountain-pass geometry and it is reasonable to search for a first critical point as a minimizer of I in $B(0, R_\lambda)$ and a second one at the mountain pass level. The existence of a minimizer will follow from a standard lower semi continuity argument, whereas in proving the existence of a mountain-pass critical point we will face the difficulty of showing that Palais-Smale sequences are bounded.

We recall that the Palais-Smale condition holds for I if any sequence $(u_n) \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $(I(u_n)) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and $||I'(u_n)||_* \to 0$ admits a convergent subsequence. The boundedness of such sequences proves to be a delicate issue due to the fact that c is sign-changing and g_λ has a slow growth at infinity and thus in particular does not satisfy an Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz type condition. Let us recall that a nonlinearity g is said to satisfy the Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz condition if

$(\mathcal{AR})$ There exist $\theta > 2$ and $s_1 > 0$ such that $0 < \theta G(s) \leq sg(s) \quad \forall s \geq s_1$,

where $G(s) = \int_0^s g(t)\, dt$. This condition is known to be central when proving that Palais-Smale sequences are bounded. When the domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is bounded and the nonlinearity is subcritical, the boundedness leads directly to the strong convergence of a subsequence.

In the case where the superquadratic term is positive, many efforts have been done to weaken the condition $(\mathcal{AR})$. However, to the best of our knowledge, this issue has not been considered for functionals of the type

$$J(u) = \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 - c(x)G(u) \right), \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

when c changes sign and g is a superlinear function not satisfying $(\mathcal{AR})$. A typical example of such a nonlinearity is $g(s) = s\ln(s+1)$.

When $g(s) = s^{p-1}$ with $p \in [2, 2^*)$, using the homogeneity of g it is straightforward that J satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. When g is not powerlike, this issue becomes delicate, as shown in [5] (see also [4]), where the authors assume that g is superlinear and asymptotically powerlike at infinity, i.e.

$(\mathcal{G})$ There exist $p > 2$ such that $\lim_{u\to\infty} \dfrac{g(u)}{u^{p-1}} = 1$.

Note that this condition implies $(\mathcal{AR})$. Furthermore, in [5] one needs to assume the so called *thick zero set* condition on $c \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$:

$(\mathcal{AT})$ $$\overline{(\Omega_+)} \cap \overline{(\Omega_-)} = \emptyset,$$

where

$$\Omega_+ := \{x \in \Omega;\ c(x) > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_- := \{x \in \Omega;\ c(x) < 0\}.$$

In [23], still under $(\mathcal{G})$, the authors were able to remove $(\mathcal{AT})$, but at the expense of some alternative strong conditions on c.

In our problem we prove that the Palais-Smale condition is satisfied without assuming $(\mathcal{AT})$ nor any special condition on c. Given $V \in L^q(\Omega)$, with $q > \frac{N}{2}$, we denote by $\lambda_1(V)$ the first eigenvalue of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + V(x)u = \lambda u & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Let us recall that $\lambda_1(V)$ is given by

$$\lambda_1(V) = \inf_{\|u\|_2=1} \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v|^2 + V(x)v^2 \right).$$

It is well-known that $\lambda_1(V)$ is simple, so that it is achieved by an unique $\varphi_1 > 0$ such that $\|\varphi_1\|_2 = 1$.

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $(\mathcal{H})$ and $c^+ \not\equiv 0$. If $\lambda_1(-c - \mu f) > 0$ then (P) has two positive solutions.*

Remark 1.2. *In* [20, Theorem 2], *assuming* $c \gneqq 0$, *it is proved that if*

$$\|\mu f\|_{\frac{N}{2}} < C_N, \tag{1.3}$$

where C_N *denotes the best Sobolev constant for the embedding* $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^{2^*}(\Omega)$, *then there exists* $\overline{c} > 0$ *such that* (P) *has at least two bounded solutions if* $\|c\|_q < \overline{c}$. *We observe that under (1.3), taking* $||c||_q$ *small enough one has* $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$. *Thus our condition is more general, even when* $c \geq 0$. *We point out however that* f *is allowed to be sign changing in* [20].

In [6, Remark 3.2] it is shown that when $c \equiv 0$, (P) has a solution if and only if $\lambda_1(-\mu f) > 0$. We now complement this result.

Lemma 1.3. *Assume* $(\mathcal{H})$.

(1) If $c \geq 0$ *then* $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$ *is necessary for* (P) *to have a non-negative solution.*
(2) $\lambda_1(-c) > 0$ *is necessary for* (P) *to have a non negative solution and under this condition every solution of* (P) *is non-negative.*

Remark 1.4. *As far as non negative solutions are concerned, Lemma 1.3 (1) shows that when* $c \geq 0$ *the condition* $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$ *is necessary in Theorem 1.1. However, other kinds of solutions of* (P), *namely negative or sign-changing solutions, may exist if* $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) \leq 0$. *See* [15] *in this direction.*

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove some preliminary results and show that the functional I has the geometry described above. Section 3 is devoted to the Cerami condition for I. Finally in Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.1, Lemma 1.3 and we give a condition under which $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$ holds, see Lemma 4.1.

1.1. **Notation.**

- The Lebesgue norm in $L^r(\Omega)$ will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|_r$ and the usual norm of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ by $\|\cdot\|$, i.e. $\|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_2$. The Holder conjugate of r is denoted by r'.
- The weak convergence is denoted by $\rightharpoonup$.
- The positive and negative parts of a function u are defined by $u^{\pm} := \max\{\pm u, 0\}$.
- If $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ then we denote its interior by $\text{int}\, U$ and its closure by $\overline{U}$. The characteristic function of U is denoted by χ_U.
- We denote by $B(0,R)$ the ball of radius R centered at 0 in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

2. Preliminaries

Lemma 2.1. *Assume* $(\mathcal{H})$.

(1) If v *is a non-negative solution of* (Q) *then* $u = \mu^{-1} ln(1+\lambda v)$ *is a non-negative solution of* (P). *Similarly if* u *is a non negative solution of* (P) *then* v *given by (1.1) is a non negative solution of* (Q).

(2) If v *is a critical point of* I *then* v *is a non-negative solution of* (Q).

(3) If u *is a non-negative solution of* (P) *then* u *is positive.*

Proof. Let $v \geq 0$ be a solution of (Q). From the expression of g_λ it is seen that v solves

$$-\Delta v = \frac{1}{\lambda} c(x)(1+\lambda v)\ln(1+\lambda v) + \frac{\mu}{\lambda} f(x)(1+\lambda v). \tag{2.1}$$

Let $u = \frac{1}{\mu}\ln(1+\lambda v)$, i.e. $\exp(\mu u) = 1+\lambda v$. Since $v \geq 0$ and $\nabla u = \frac{\lambda}{\mu}\frac{\nabla v}{1+\lambda v}$, one may easily see that $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. If $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ then $\psi = \frac{\phi}{1+\lambda v} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, so that (2.1) provides

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \nabla v \nabla \psi &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)\psi(1+\lambda v)\ln(1+\lambda v) + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)\psi(1+\lambda v)\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)\phi\ln(1+\lambda v) + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)\phi. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Now, from $\nabla v = \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\exp(\mu u)\nabla u$ and $\nabla\psi = \frac{\nabla\phi}{1+\lambda v} - \frac{\lambda\phi\nabla v}{(1+\lambda v)^2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \nabla v\nabla\psi &= \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega \exp(\mu u)\nabla u\left(\frac{\nabla\phi}{1+\lambda v} - \frac{\lambda\phi\nabla v}{(1+\lambda v)^2}\right) = \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega \nabla u\left(\nabla\phi - \frac{\lambda\phi\nabla v}{1+\lambda v}\right)\\ &= \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega \nabla u\left(\nabla\phi - \frac{\mu\phi\exp(\mu u)\nabla u}{1+\lambda v}\right) = \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega \left(\nabla u\nabla\phi - \mu|\nabla u|^2\phi\right).\end{aligned}$$

Futhermore, we have

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)\phi\ln(1+\lambda v) = \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)u\phi,$$

so we deduce from (2.2) that u is a solution of (P). By similar arguments we prove the reverse statement. This proves (1).

To prove (2), let v be a critical point of I. Then

$$\int_\Omega \left[\nabla v\nabla\varphi - (c(x)+\mu f(x))v^+\varphi\right] - \int_\Omega c(x)g_\lambda(v^+)\varphi - \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)\varphi = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

for all $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Taking $\varphi = -v^-$ we get

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v^-|^2 + \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)v^- = 0.$$

Since $f \geq 0$, we get

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v^-|^2 \leq 0$$

and it follows that $v^- \equiv 0$, i.e. $v \geq 0$. The proof that $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ can be found in [20, Lemma 13], so we omit it.

Finally, if $u \geq 0$ is a solution of (P) then, since $\mu > 0$ and $f \geq 0$, u is a bounded weak supersolution of

$$-\Delta u = c(x)u, \quad u \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

By a standard argument relying on the Harnack inequality, see [25, Theorem 1.2], we have either $u \equiv 0$ or $u > 0$. Since $f \gneqq 0$, we get $u > 0$. □

We shall prove now that when $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$ the functional I takes positive values on a sphere centered at the orign if λ is sufficiently large. To this aim we first analyze the behavior of g_λ with respect to s and λ. Note that for any $\lambda > 0$ fixed, g_λ is superlinear at $+\infty$, i.e.

$$\frac{g_\lambda(s)}{s} \to \infty \quad \text{as} \quad s \to +\infty. \tag{2.4}$$

Furthermore g_λ is uniformly superlinear at 0, i.e.

$$\frac{g_\lambda(s)}{s} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad s \to 0 \quad \text{uniformly with respect to } \lambda. \tag{2.5}$$

We provide now a global estimate on G_λ involving s and λ:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $p > 1$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$G_\lambda(s) \le \varepsilon s^2 + C_\varepsilon(1 + \ln \lambda)s^{p+1}, \quad \forall s > 0, \ \forall \lambda \ge 1.$$

Proof. It is enough to show that given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$g_\lambda(s) \le \varepsilon s + C_\varepsilon(1 + \ln \lambda)s^{p}, \quad \forall s > 0, \ \forall \lambda \ge 1.$$

From (2.5) there exists $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$g_\lambda(s) \le \varepsilon s, \ \forall s \in [0, s_0], \ \forall \lambda > 0.$$

Now, if $\lambda \ge 1$ then, $\forall s > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} g_\lambda(s) &\le \frac{1}{\lambda}\left[\lambda(1+s)\ln(\lambda(1+s))\right] = (\ln \lambda)(1+s) + (1+s)\ln(1+s) \\ &\le (1 + \ln \lambda)\left[(1+s) + (1+s)\ln(1+s)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Since

$$\frac{(1+s) + (1+s)\ln(1+s)}{s^p} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad s \to \infty,$$

there exists $s_1 > s_0$ such that

$$(1+s) + (1+s)\ln(1+s) \le \varepsilon s^p, \quad \forall s \ge s_1.$$

Finally, by continuity, there exists $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(1+s) + (1+s)\ln(1+s) \le C_\varepsilon s^p, \quad \forall s \in [s_0, s_1].$$

Taking C_ε sufficiently large, we get

$$g_\lambda(s) \le \varepsilon s + C_\varepsilon(1 + \ln \lambda)s^{p}, \quad \forall s > 0, \ \forall \lambda \ge 1.$$

□

Lemma 2.3. *Let $V \in L^q(\Omega)$, with $q > \frac{N}{2}$. If $\lambda_1(V) > 0$ then there exists $K_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v|^2 + V(x)(v^+)^2\right) \ge K_1\|v\|^2 \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. Let us first prove that there exists a constant $K_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v|^2 + V(x)v^2\right) \ge K_1\|v\|^2 \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{2.8}$$

Indeed, assume by contradiction that there is a sequence $(v_n) \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v_n|^2 + V(x)(v_n)^2\right) \le \frac{\|v_n\|^2}{n}.$$

Setting $w_n = \frac{v_n}{\|v_n\|}$ we may assume that, up to a subsequence,

$$w_n \rightharpoonup w_0 \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad w_n \to w_0 \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \text{ for } r \in [1, 2^*).$$

In particular since $q > \frac{N}{2}$ we have that $w_n \to w_0$ in $L^{2q'}(\Omega)$. Thus from

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla w_n|^2 + V(x)(w_n)^2\right) \le \frac{1}{n} \tag{2.9}$$

it follows that

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla w_0|^2 + V(x)(w_0)^2\right) \le 0. \tag{2.10}$$

We claim that $w_0 \not\equiv 0$. Indeed, if $w_0 \equiv 0$ then $w_n \to 0$ in $L^{2q'}(\Omega)$ and (2.9) yields $w_n \to 0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, which is impossible since $\|w_n\| = 1$. Hence $w_0 \not\equiv 0$ and consequently (2.10) provides

$\lambda_1(V) \le 0$, which contradicts our assumption. Thus (2.8) is proved. Finally, we may assume that $K_1 \le 1$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v|^2 + V(x)(v^+)^2\right) &= \int_\Omega |\nabla v^-|^2 + \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v^+|^2 + V(x)(v^+)^2\right)\\ &\ge \|v^-\|^2 + K_1\|v^+\|^2 \ge K_1\|v\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

We are now ready to prove that I has the appropriate geometry when λ is large enough:

Proposition 2.4. *Assume that $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$. There exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that if $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$ then, for some $M_\lambda, R_\lambda > 0$, there holds $I(v) \ge M_\lambda$ if $\|v\| = R_\lambda$.*

Proof. Since $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$, by Lemma 2.3 there exists $K_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla v|^2 - [c(x) + \mu f(x)](v^+)^2\right) \ge K_1\|v\|^2 \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Let $p > 1$, close to 1, satisfy $(p+1)q' < 2^*$. This choice of p is possible since $q > \frac{N}{2}$. By Lemma 2.2, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $\lambda \ge 1$ we have

$$I(v) \ge K_1\|v\|^2 - C_1\varepsilon\|v\|^2 - C_\varepsilon(1+\ln\lambda)\|v\|^{p+1} - \frac{\|\mu f\|_q}{\lambda}\|v\|,$$

for some $C_1 > 0$. Hence

$$I(v) \ge (K_1 - C_1\varepsilon)R^2 - C_\varepsilon(1+\ln\lambda)R^{p+1} - \frac{\|\mu f\|_q}{\lambda}R$$

if $\|v\| = R$.

We fix $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $K_2 := K_1 - C_1\varepsilon > 0$ and set $R = \lambda^{-\theta}$ with $\theta \in (0,1)$. Then

$$I(v) \ge \lambda^{-2\theta}\left(K_2 - C_\varepsilon(1+\ln\lambda)\lambda^{\theta(1-p)} - \lambda^{\theta-1}\|\mu f\|_q\right).$$

Since $p > 1 > \theta > 0$, we have

$$(1+\ln\lambda)\lambda^{\theta(1-p)} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^{\theta-1} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to \infty.$$

Thus

$$I(v) \ge M_\lambda > 0$$

if λ is sufficiently large and $\|v\| = R_\lambda := \lambda^{-\theta}$. □

3. The Palais-Smale condition

From now on, we fix $\lambda = \lambda_0$ where λ_0 is given by Proposition 2.4. We set

$$\alpha_c = \inf\left\{\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u|^2 - \mu f(x)(u^+)^2\right); u \in H_0^1(\Omega),\ \|u\|_2 = 1,\ cu^+ \equiv 0\right\}.$$

In the next proposition, we shall use an explicit expression of G_λ, namely,

$$\begin{aligned}G_\lambda(s) &= \frac{1}{4\lambda^2}\left[(1+\lambda s)^2\left(2\ln(1+\lambda s) - 1\right) + 1\right] - \frac{s^2}{2}\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\left[\frac{(\lambda s)^2}{2}\ln(1+\lambda s) - \frac{(\lambda s)^2}{4} - \frac{\lambda s}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\ln(1+\lambda s) + \lambda s\ln(1+\lambda s)\right] - \frac{s^2}{2}\\ &= \frac{s^2}{2}\ln(1+\lambda s) - \frac{s^2}{4} - \frac{s}{2\lambda} + \frac{1}{2\lambda^2}\ln(1+\lambda s) + \frac{s}{\lambda}\ln(1+\lambda s) - \frac{s^2}{2} \qquad (3.1)\end{aligned}$$

for $s > 0$.

Proposition 3.1. *If $\alpha_c > 0$ then I satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.*

Proof. Let (u_n) be a Palais-Smale sequence for I at the level $d \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e.

$$I(u_n) \to d \quad \text{and} \quad \|I'(u_n)\|_* \to 0. \tag{3.2}$$

From (3.2) we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla u_n|^2 - (c(x)+\mu f(x))(u_n^+)^2\right] - \int_\Omega c(x)G_\lambda(u_n^+) - \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)u_n = d + o(1) \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\left|\int_\Omega \left[\nabla u_n \nabla\varphi - (c(x)+\mu f(x))u_n^+\varphi\right] - \int_\Omega c(x)g_\lambda(u_n^+)\varphi - \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)\varphi\right| \le \varepsilon_n\|\varphi\| \tag{3.4}$$

for some sequence $\varepsilon_n \to 0$ and for every $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. In particular, we have

$$|\langle I'(u_n), u_n\rangle| \le \varepsilon_n\|u_n\|. \tag{3.5}$$

Let us assume that $\|u_n\| \to \infty$ and set $v_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|}$. Up to a subsequence, we have

$$v_n \rightharpoonup v_0 \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega), \quad v_n \to v_0 \text{ in } L^r(\Omega),\ \forall r \in [1,2^*), \quad \text{and} \quad v_n \to v_0 \ a.e. \text{ in } \Omega.$$

We claim that $cv_0^+ \equiv 0$. Indeed, from (3.4) we have, using the convergences above,

$$\int_\Omega c(x)\frac{g_\lambda(u_n^+)}{\|u_n\|}\varphi = \int_\Omega \left[\nabla v_0\nabla\varphi - (c(x)+\mu f(x))v_0^+\varphi\right] + o(1) < \infty, \tag{3.6}$$

for every $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. If $cv_0^+ \not\equiv 0$ then we may choose $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and a measurable subset $\Omega_\varphi \subset \Omega$ such that

$$|\Omega_\varphi| > 0, \quad cv_0^+\varphi > 0 \text{ on } \Omega_\varphi \subset \Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad cv_0^+\varphi = 0 \text{ on } \Omega\setminus\Omega_\varphi.$$

Now, from (2.4), we have

$$\liminf c(x)\frac{g_\lambda(u_n^+)}{\|u_n\|}\varphi = \liminf c(x)v_n^+\frac{g_\lambda(\|u_n\|v_n^+)}{\|u_n\|v_n^+}\varphi = +\infty \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega_\varphi.$$

Fatou's lemma then yields a contradiction with (3.6). Therefore $cv_0^+ \equiv 0$, i.e. $v_0^+ = 0$ in $\Omega_+ \cup \Omega_-$. On the other hand, taking $\varphi = v_0$ in (3.4) and dividing it by $\|u_n\|$ we get

$$\int_\Omega \left[\nabla v_n\nabla v_0 - (c(x)+\mu f(x))v_n^+v_0\right] \to 0,$$

so that, using $v_n \rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $cv_0^+ \equiv 0$, we get

$$\int_\Omega \left[|\nabla v_0|^2 - \mu f(x)(v_0^+)^2\right] = 0.$$

Thus $v_0 \equiv 0$ (otherwise $\alpha_c \le 0$). Now from (3.4) we have, taking $\varphi = u_n$ and using the definition (1.2) of g_λ,

$$\left|\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_n|^2 - \mu f(x))(u_n^+)^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)(1+\lambda u_n^+)\ln(1+\lambda u_n^+)u_n^+ - \frac{\mu}{\lambda}\int_\Omega f(x)u_n^+\right| \le \varepsilon_n\|u_n\|. \tag{3.7}$$

Dividing by $||u_n||^2$ and using that $v_n \to 0$ in $L^r(\Omega), \forall r \in [1,2^*)$ we get

$$1 - \int_\Omega c(x)(v_n^+)^2\ln(1+\lambda||u_n||v_n^+) \to 0.$$

Now, using the property $\ln(st) = \ln s + \ln t$, it follows that

$$1 - \ln(||u_n||)\int_\Omega c(x)(v_n^+)^2 - \int_\Omega c(x)(v_n^+)^2\ln\left(\lambda v_n^+ + \frac{1}{||u_n||}\right) \to 0.$$

We claim that

$$\ln(||u_n||)\int_\Omega c(x)(v_n^+)^2 \to 0. \tag{3.8}$$

In that case we would get

$$\int_\Omega c(x)(v_n^+)^2 \ln\left(\lambda v_n^+ + \frac{1}{||u_n||}\right) \to 1,$$

which clearly contradicts the fact that $v_0 = 0$. To prove (3.8) we define for every $s > 0$

$$H_\lambda(s) = \frac{1}{2} g_\lambda(s)s - G_\lambda(s).$$

From (1.2) and (3.1) it follows that

$$H_\lambda(s) = \frac{s^2}{4} + \frac{s}{2\lambda} - \frac{s}{2\lambda}\ln(1+\lambda s) - \frac{1}{2\lambda^2}\ln(1+\lambda s) \tag{3.9}$$

From (3.5) we get

$$I(u_n) - \frac{1}{2}\langle I'(u_n), u_n\rangle = c + \varepsilon_n\|u_n\| + o(1),$$

which leads, using the definition of H_λ, to

$$\int_\Omega c(x) H_\lambda(u_n^+) - \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega f(x)u_n = c + \varepsilon_n\|u_n\| + o(1). \tag{3.10}$$

Now, combining (3.9) and (3.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega c(x)(u_n^+)^2 &= c + \varepsilon_n\|u_n\| + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)u_n^+ - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)u_n^+\ln(1+\lambda u_n^+)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\lambda^2}\int_\Omega c(x)\ln(1+\lambda u_n^+) + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega f(x)u_n + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\ln(||u_n||)\int_\Omega c(x)(v_n^+)^2 &= 4\frac{\ln||u_n||}{||u_n||^2}\Big(c + \varepsilon_n\|u_n\| + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)u_n^+ - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\int_\Omega c(x)u_n^+\ln(1+\lambda u_n^+)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\lambda^2}\int_\Omega c(x)\ln(1+\lambda u_n^+) + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega f(x)u_n + o(1)\Big) \to 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.8) is proved and we reach a contradiction. Therefore (u_n) must be bounded and, up to subsequence, we have $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $u_n \to u_0$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ for $p \in [1, 2^*)$. At this point the strong convergence follows in a standard way. We refer to [20, Lemma 11] for a proof. □

Corollary 3.2. *If $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$ then I satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.*

Proof. Let $\|u\|_2 = 1$ with $cu^+ \equiv 0$. Since $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f) > 0$, by Lemma 2.3 there is a constant $K_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u|^2 - \mu f(x)(u^+)^2\right) &= \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u|^2 - (c(x) + \mu f(x))(u^+)^2\right)\\ &\geq K_1\|u\|^2 \geq SK_1\|u\|_2^2 = SK_1 > 0,\end{aligned}$$

where S is the best Sobolev constant for the embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$. Thus $\alpha_c > 0$ and by Proposition 3.1 we get the conclusion. □

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 1.3

We are now ready to prove our main results.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: By Proposition 2.4 we know that if $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)>0$ and $\lambda=\lambda_0$ then there are $M_\lambda, R_\lambda>0$ such that $I(v)\geq M_\lambda$ if $\|v\|=R_\lambda$. Moreover, it easily seen that if $f\not\equiv 0$ then I takes negative values in the ball $B(0,R_\lambda)$. Therefore, by weak lower semi-continuity, we infer that the infimum of I in $B(0,R_\lambda)$ is achieved by some $v_1\not\equiv 0$, which is a critical point of I. Furthermore, since $G_\lambda(s)/s^2\to\infty$ as $s\to\infty$, if v is a smooth function supported in Ω_+ then $I(tv)\to-\infty$ as $t\to\infty$. We fix $t>0$ and v such that $v_0=tv$ satisfies $\|v_0\|>R_\lambda$ and $I(v_0)<0$. Now let

$$\Gamma:=\{\gamma\in\mathcal{C}([0,1],H_0^1(\Omega));\ \gamma(0)=0,\gamma(1)=v_0\}$$

and

$$d:=\inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\max_{t\in[0,1]} I(\gamma(t)).$$

Since I satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, by the mountain-pass theorem it is straightforward that I has a critical point w_1, which, by Proposition 2.4, satisfies $I(w_1)=d>0$. In particular, we have $v_1\neq w_1$. Finally, from Lemma 2.1, we know that these two critical points provide two positive solutions of (P). □

Proof of Lemma 1.3. By Lemma 2.1, we know that if $u\geq 0$ is a solution of (P) then $v\geq 0$ given by (1.1) is a solution of (Q). Taking $\phi>0$, the first positive eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)$, as test function and using the property that $g_\lambda\geq 0$ on $\mathbb{R}$ we obtain

$$\int_\Omega(\nabla u\nabla\phi-c(x)u\phi-\mu f(x)u\phi)=\int_\Omega\Big(c(x)g_\lambda(v)\phi+\frac{\mu}{\lambda}f(x)\phi\Big)>0,$$

so that

$$\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)\int_\Omega u\phi>0.$$

Thus $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)>0$ and this proves the first point.

Similarly, let $\varphi>0$ be an eigenfunction associated to $\lambda_1(-c)$ and assume that $u\geq 0$ is a solution of (P). Taking $\varphi>0$ as test function we get

$$\int_\Omega(\nabla u\nabla\varphi-c(x)u\varphi)=\int_\Omega\big(\mu|\nabla u|^2\varphi+f(x)\varphi\big)>0.$$

Thus

$$\lambda_1(-c)\int_\Omega u\varphi>0,$$

so that $\lambda_1(-c)>0$. Finally, let u be a solution of (P). Using u^- as test function in (P), we obtain

$$-\int_\Omega(|\nabla u^-|^2-c(x)|u^-|^2)=\int_\Omega(\mu|\nabla u|^2u^-+f(x)u^-)\geq 0.$$

Hence

$$\int_\Omega(|\nabla u^-|^2-c(x)|u^-|^2)\leq 0$$

and since $\lambda_1(-c)>0$ we get $u^-\equiv 0$, i.e. $u\geq 0$. □

We end this paper by deriving a condition under which $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)>0$ holds.

Considering c and f as fixed, we may rewrite the condition $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)>0$ as an explicit condition on μ. To this end, we assume that $\lambda_1(-c)>0$ and set

$$\gamma_1(-c,f):=\inf\left\{\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla u|^2-c(x)u^2\right);\ u\in H_0^1(\Omega),\ \int_\Omega fu^2=1\right\}. \tag{4.1}$$

It is well-known, see [22], that $\gamma_1(-c,f)$ is the first eigenvalue of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u-c(x)u=\gamma f(x)u & \text{in} \quad \Omega,\\ u=0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mu>0$ and $f\gneqq 0$. Then $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)>0$ if and only if $\lambda_1(-c)>0$ and $0<\mu<\gamma_1(-c,f)$.*

Proof. Note first that since $\mu f\geq 0$ we have

$$\lambda_1(-c)\geq\lambda_1(-c-\mu f).$$

It is also clear that if $\lambda_1(-c)>0$ then $\gamma_1(-c,f)>0$. Hence, if $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)>0$ we have $\lambda_1(-c)>0$ and $\gamma_1(-c,f)>0$. Moreover

$$\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla u|^2-[c(x)+\mu f(x)]u^2\right)>0$$

for every $u\not\equiv 0$. Thus, if $\int_\Omega fu^2=1$ then

$$\mu<\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla u|^2-c(x)u^2\right).$$

Since $\gamma_1(-c,f)$ is achieved we have $\mu<\gamma_1(-c,f)$.

Let us now assume that $\lambda_1(-c)>0$ and $0<\mu<\gamma_1(c,f)$. Since $f\gneqq 0$ and $\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)$ is achieved by some $\phi>0$, we have $\int_\Omega f\phi^2>0$ and consequently

$$\frac{\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla\phi|^2-c(x)\phi^2\right)}{\int_\Omega f\phi^2}\geq\gamma_1(-c,f)>\mu$$

so that

$$\lambda_1(-c-\mu f)=\int_\Omega\left(|\nabla\phi|^2-[c(x)+\mu f(x)]\phi^2\right)>0.$$

□

Theorem 1.1 can then be restated as follows:

Corollary 4.2. *Assume $(\mathcal{H})$, $c^+\not\equiv 0$ and $\lambda_1(-c)>0$. Then (P) has two positive solutions for $0<\mu<\gamma_1(-c,f)$.*

References

[1] H. Abdel Hamid, M.F. Bidaut-Véron, On the connection between two quasilinear elliptic problems with source terms of order 0 or 1, *Comm. Contemp. Math.*, **12**, (2010), 727-788.

[2] B. Abdellaoui, I. Peral, A. Primo, Elliptic problems with a Hardy potential and critical growth in the gradient: Non-resonance and blow-up results, *J. Differential Equations* **239**, (2007), 386-416.

[3] B. Abdellaoui, A. Dall'Aglio, I. Peral, Some remarks on elliptic problems with critical growth in the gradient, *J. Differential Equations*, **222**, (2006), 21-62 + Corr. *J. Differential Equations*, **246** (2009), 2988-2990.

[4] S. Alama, M. Del Pino, Solutions of elliptic equations with indefinite nonlinearities via Morse theory and linking, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **13**, (1996), 95-115.

[5] S. Alama, G. Tarantello, On semilinear elliptic equations with indefinite nonlinearities, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **1**, (1993), 439-475.

[6] D. Arcoya, C. De Coster, L. Jeanjean, K. Tanaka, Continuum of solutions for an elliptic problem with critical growth in the gradient, arXiv 1304.3066, submitted.

[7] D. Arcoya, C. De Coster, L. Jeanjean, K. Tanaka, Remarks on the uniqueness for quasilinear elliptic equations with quadratic growth conditions, *J. Math, Anal. Appl.*, **420**, 1, 2014, 772-780.
[8] D. Arcoya, S. Segura de León, Uniqueness of solutions for some elliptic equations with a quadratic gradient term, *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, **16**, (2010), 327-336.
[9] G. Barles, A.P. Blanc, C. Georgelin, M. Kobylanski, Remarks on the maximum principle for nonlinear elliptic PDE with quadratic growth conditions, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa*, **28**, (1999), 381-404.
[10] G. Barles, F. Murat, Uniqueness and the maximum principle for quasilinear elliptic equations with quadratic growth conditions, *Arch. Rational. Mech Anal.*, **133**, (1995), 77-101.
[11] G. Barles, A. Porretta, Uniqueness for unbounded solutions to stationary viscous Hamilton-Jacobi equations, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.*, **5**, (2006), 107-136.
[12] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.P. Puel, Existence de solutions faibles pour des équations elliptiques quasi-linéaires à croissance quadratique, *Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications. Collège de France Seminar, Vol. IV (Paris, 1981/1982)*, 19–73, *Res. Notes in Math.*, 84, *Pitman, Boston, Mass.-London*, 1983.
[13] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.P. Puel, Existence of bounded solutions for nonlinear elliptic unilateral problems, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, **152**, (1988), 183–196.
[14] L. Boccardo, F. Murat, J.P. Puel, L^∞ estimate for some nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations and application to an existence result, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **23**, (1992), 326–333.
[15] C. De Coster, L. Jeanjean, Multiplicity result in the non-resonant case for an elliptic problem with critical growth in the gradient, in preparation.
[16] V. Ferone, F. Murat, Quasilinear problems having quadratic growth in the gradient: an existence result when the source term is small, *Équations aux dérivées partielles et applications, Gauthier-Villars, Éd. Sci. Méd. Elsevier, Paris,* (1998), 497–515.
[17] V. Ferone, F. Murat, Nonlinear problems having quadratic growth in the gradient: an existence result when the source term is small, *Nonlinear Anal. TMA*, **42**, (2000), 1309–1326.
[18] N. Grenon, F. Murat, A. Poretta, A priori estimates and existence for elliptic equations with gradient dependent term, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.*, **13**, (2014) 137-205.
[19] F. Hamel, E. Russ, Comparison results for semilinear elliptic equations using a new symmetrization method, ArXiv 1401.1726.
[20] L. Jeanjean, B. Sirakov, Existence and multiplicity for elliptic problems with quadratic growth in the gradient, *Comm. Part. Diff. Equ.*, **38**, (2013), 244–264.
[21] J.L. Kazdan, R.J. Kramer, Invariant criteria for existence of solutions to second-order quasilinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **31**, (1978), 619–645.
[22] A. Manes, A.M. Micheletti, Un'estensione della teoria variazionale classica degli autovalori per operatori ellittici del secondo ordine, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.* **7** (1973), 285-301.
[23] M. Ramos, S. Terracini, C. Troestler, Superlinear indefinite elliptic problems and Pohozaev type identities, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **159**, (1998), 596-628.
[24] B. Sirakov, Solvability of uniformly elliptic fully nonlinear PDE, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, **195**, (2010), 579–607.
[25] N. Trudinger, On Harnack type inequalities and their application to quasilinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **20** (1967) 721?747.

L. Jeanjean
Laboratoire de Mathématiques (UMR 6623), Université de Franche-Comté, 16 route de Gray 25030 Besançon Cedex, France
E-mail address: louis.jeanjean@univ-fcomte.fr

H. Ramos Quoirin
Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Casilla 307, Correo 2, Santiago, Chile
E-mail address: humberto.ramos@usach.cl